

### **REMARKS**

In the Official Action the Examiner rejects claims 1-2, 5-6, 11-13, 16-22, 25, 28 and 32-33 under 35 U.S.C. 102 as allegedly being anticipated by Deep. This grounds for rejection is respectfully traversed. Deep discloses a method for allowing users to purchase professional services in a private chat room through an Internet brokerage via the Internet.

Referring to the Examiner's rejection of claim 1, the Examiner asserts that Deep teaches means for receiving a request...said request including information regarding the proposed purpose of said virtual room pointing the applicant to col. 2, starting at line 63 continuing on to col. 3, line 6 of Deep.

With all due respect to the Examiner, it is not understood where Deep teaches "said request including information regarding the proposed purpose of said virtual room" as specifically recited in claim 1. The passage cited by the Examiner is reproduced below:

The service brokerage establishes a relationship with multiple service providers. As part of this process, the service brokerage can develop an information file that is specific to an individual service provider. This file can contain a variety of information, such as the qualifications or references of the service provider, preferences of the service provider, areas of specialization of the service provider, dates the service provider is available, the time zone from which the service provider will be providing its services, limitations the service provider places on access to its services, rates of the service provider for its services, and so forth.

Note that while the brokerage service can develop a "information file" that is "specific to an individual service provider", there is no indication whatsoever that any information is regarding the proposed purpose of the virtual room. Indeed, it would seem that Deep's broker wants to set up as many possible connections as he can between individual service providers and users and therefore collects information to set forth the qualifications of service providers and also make sure that the broker gets paid for services rendered since he is obviously worried about the credit worthiness of his users. However, where is there any suggestion that Deep cares two cents about the proposed

purpose of the virtual room much less where is there any indication that Deep cares about or verifies “the legitimacy of said proposed purpose” or provides “said virtual room only if said proposed purpose meets one or more preselected criteria”? Where is any of that disclosed by Deep?

Claim 5 recites a server “being programmed on receiving a request from at least one party to provide a virtual room, wherein said request includes information specifying a proposed purpose of said virtual room, to verify the legitimacy of said proposed purpose and to provide said virtual room only if said proposed purpose meets one or more predetermined criteria...”. Note that in claim 5 the at least one party is a party in a private virtual room. In Deep, where is any party who is going to communicate in a virtual private room “issuing a request...to provide a virtual room, wherein said request includes information specifying a proposed purpose of said virtual room” to a server? Note Fig. 2 of Deep wherein it is indicated that the service provider sets, among other things, the “availability for chat room”. So it seems that the service provider can indicate that that the chat room is available for any purpose whatsoever. Additionally, where is there any suggestion that a server verifies “the legitimacy of said proposed purpose” and provides “said virtual room only if said proposed purpose meets one or more predetermined criteria”?

Turning now to claim 19, how is the limitation “the request including information regarding the proposed purpose of the virtual room” met by Deep? Moreover, where is there any suggestion that the service “verifies the legitimacy of the proposed purpose” or that the service provider “provides the virtual room only if the proposed purpose meets one or more predetermined criteria”?

It is submitted that the Examiner has failed to show how Deep anticipates any of the claims mentioned above and therefore it is submitted that those claims, and the claims which depend thereon, are clearly patentable over Deep.

Claim 9 was rejected based upon Deep in view of Ta. Claim 9 has been amended to recite that “three or more pre-screened parties communicate electronically, the parties each being pre-screened against common predetermined criteria” which is clearly different than Deep.

Turning now to claim 26, claim 26 was rejected based upon Deep in view of Ta. As the Examiner will note, claim 26 has been amended to recite that the service provider verifies both the integrity of

the data within the or each said environment and also "the legitimacy of uses made of said at least one virtual room". For reasons already discussed, it is believed that that limitation suffices to sufficiently differentiate claim 26 from Deep. The Examiner will note that the limitation added to claim 26 came from claim 27 which the Examiner asserted in the Official Action as being met by Deep. The passage quoted by the Examiner as meeting that limitation has already been reproduced above and it is submitted that there is no such teaching in Deep.

New dependent claims 34-37 are added by this response. These claims, since they all depend from claim 1, are believed to also patentably distinguish themselves over Deep. For example, claim 34 recites that there are three or more parties in a virtual room and in Deep there can apparently be only two parties, namely a service provider and a single user. Note Deep, col. 3, lines 29-37.

Reconsideration of this application as amended is respectfully requested.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first-class mail in an envelope addressed to Commissioner of Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on

December 30, 2005  
(Date of Deposit)

Mia Kim

  
(Signature)

12/30/05  
(Date)

Respectfully submitted,



Richard P. Berg  
Attorney for Applicant  
Reg. No. 28,145  
LADAS & PARRY  
5670 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 2100  
Los Angeles, California 90036  
(323) 934-2300